

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 14, 2008. No new matter is added. Claims 1-9 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 10-17 are new. No new matter is added. Claims 10-17 are pending.

Drawing Objections:

The drawings are objected to for containing hand written features and for not containing reference numbers. The drawings and the specification are amended to overcome these objections. No new matter is added. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Specification Objections:

The Abstract is objected to for having over 150 words. The Abstract is amended to have less than 150 words. No new matter is added. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claim Objections:

Claim 2 is objected for informalities. As claim 2 is currently cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, this objection is now moot. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

§101 Rejections:

Claims 1-9 are rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As claims 1-9 are currently cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, this rejection is now moot. Applicants note that new claims 10-18 are directed to tools and methods for building an information system onto a computer-readable medium. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

§112, First Paragraph:

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As claims 1 and 4 are currently cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer,

this rejection is now moot. Applicants note that new claims 10-17 do not recite the term "new technologies" that was highlighted in the rejection. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

§112, Second Paragraph:

Claims 1-9 are rejected as being indefinite for a variety of reasons. As claims 1-9 are currently cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, these rejections are now moot. Applicants note that new claims 10-17 do not contain any language these rejections found indefinite. Withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

§102 Rejections:

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9 are rejected as being anticipated by Turner (US Patent No. 6,230,309). As claims 1, 3-7 and 9 are currently cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, this rejection is now moot. Applicants do not concede the correctness of this rejection. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

§103 Rejections:

Claims 2 and 8 are rejected as being unpatentable over Turner in view of Goodwin (US Patent No. 6,199,195). This rejection is traversed. As claims 2 and 8 are currently cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, this rejection is now moot. Applicants do not concede the correctness of this rejection. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

New Claims:

In order to expedite the prosecution of this matter the following is noted regarding claims 10-18 with respect to Turner and Goodwin, to the extent that these references apply.

Claim 10 is directed to a tool for building an information system onto a computer-readable medium that requires, among other features, a builder component that receives one or more transaction structures and one or more information views that form a business process, and creates a plurality of definitions using the one or more transaction

structures and the one or more information views. Claim 10 also requires that after the information system is assembled, the information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views without any downtime.

Turner and Goodwin, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features. Turner is directed to a design tool for assembling component objects to form an object-based computer system application that has a declarative user input interface mechanism and a design engine. The declarative user input interface uses declarative statements to generate application design definitions (see column 4, lines 41-62). However, nowhere does Turner mention that the declarative user input interface receives one or more transaction structures and one or more information views that form a business process, as required by the builder of claim 10.

Moreover, nowhere does Turner teach or suggest that after an information system is assembled, it is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views without any downtime. As discussed above, nowhere does Turner mention the use of one or more transaction structures and one or more information views that form a business process. Also, nowhere does Turner mention that its information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views.

Goodwin does not overcome these issues of Turner. Goodwin is directed to a method for generating source code objects. Nowhere does Goodwin mention a builder component that receives one or more transaction structures and one or more information views that form a business process, and creates a plurality of definitions using the one or more transaction structures and the one or more information views, or that after the information system is assembled, the information system is modifiable or expandable by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views without any downtime, as required by claim 10. For at least these reasons claim 10 is not suggested by Turner or Goodwin, either alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Claims 11-17 depend from claim 10 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Claim 17 is directed to a method for building an information system onto a computer- readable medium that requires, inter alia, creating a plurality of definitions with a builder that uses one or more transaction structures and one or more information views that form a business process. Claim 17 further requires modifying and expanding the information system if one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views are received by the builder.

Turner and Goodwin, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features. As discussed above, with respect to claim 10, Turner is directed to a design tool for assembling component objects to form an object-based computer system application that has a declarative user input interface mechanism and a design engine. The declarative user input interface uses declarative statements to generate application design definitions (see column 4, lines 41-62). However, nowhere does Turner mention creating a plurality of definitions with a builder that uses one or more transaction structures and one or more information views that form a business process, as required by the method of claim 17.

Moreover, nowhere does Turner teach or suggest modifying and expanding the information system if one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views are received by the builder without any downtime. As discussed above, nowhere does Turner mention the use of one or more transaction structures and one or more information views that form a business process. Also, nowhere does Turner mention modifying or expanding the information system by one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more additional information views.

Goodwin does not overcome these issues of Turner. Goodwin is directed to a method for generating source code objects. Nowhere does Goodwin mention creating a plurality of definitions with a builder that uses one or more transaction structures and one or more information views that form a business process, assembling the information system with an executor engine that uses the plurality of definitions created by the builder to assemble the information system at run time, or modifying and expanding the information system if one or more additional transaction structures and/or one or more information views are received by the builder, as required by claim 17. For at least these

reasons claim 17 is not suggested by Turner or Goodwin, either alone or in combination, and should be allowed.

Conclusion:


Applicants respectfully assert that claims 10-17 are in condition for allowance. If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicants' primary attorney-of record, James A. Larson (Reg. No. 40,443), at (612) 455-3805.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

Dated: June 11, 2008

By: _____


James A. Larson
Reg. No. 40,443
JAL/ahk